Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2011-09-28
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-22
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-24
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-08-22
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-22

Agency: 024 - Department of Homeland Security **Bureau:** 58 - Customs and Border Protection

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: CBP - Mobile Surveillance Capabilities (MSC)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (UII): 024-000005218

Section B: Investment Detail

1. **Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

This investment contains both IT and Non-IT elements, thus will be classified as a mixed investment. The purpose of the MSC is to provide area surveillance in rural, remote areas over a range of 8 to 12 kilometers. Capabilities are detection, identification, and tracking of items of interest (IOI's) until successfully culminating in a law enforcement conclusion. Sensory equipment may include electro-optical/infrared (EO/IR) cameras, ground surveillance radars (GSR), laser range finders, laser illuminators, global positioning systems (GPS), and command, control, communication (C3) systems. MSC capability is needed along the high threat areas within Arizona in fulfillment of CBP Mission, Goal 1.1 in an effort to secure the southwest border. MSC allows Border Patrol to relocate surveillance assets based on changes in threat patterns and provides area coverage. MSC is in alignment with CBP?s 2009-2014 Strategic Plan states that CBP must: Establish and maintain effective control of air, land, and maritime borders through the use of the appropriate mix of infrastructure, technology and personnel. A segment of the border between ports of entry is considered under effective control when CBP can simultaneously and consistently achieve the following: detect illegal entries into the United States, identify and classify these entries to determine the level of threat involved, efficiently and effectively respond to these entries, and bring each event to a satisfactory law enforcement resolution. Persistent surveillance is a critical capability needed to establish and maintain control of our border. Long range persistent

surveillance enables CBP to efficiently and effectively manage rural and remote areas of interest. CBP leverages mobile surveillance capabilities to the greatest extent possible because of the ability to redeploy these resources as border threats change their routes along the border that will benefit CBP Border Patrol agents. The MSC program will be deployed where sufficient road infrastructure exists and land mobile voice communications are reliable. MSC, will support the collective surveillance plan in which multiple technologies will be deployed, as a result the combined technologies will dependently fulfill CBP?s Strategic Plan. The MSC program is independent of the other OTIA programs.

2. **How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

The mission benefit is to provide mobile surveillance and situational awareness in rural, remote areas over a range of 8 to 12 kilometers. Operational capabilities include; detection, identification, and tracking of items of interest (IOIs) until successfully culminating in a law enforcement resolution. The capability is needed along the high threat areas within Arizona in fulfillment of CBP Mission, Goal 1.1 in an effort to secure the southwest border. MSC allows Border Patrol to relocate surveillance assets based on changes in threat patterns and provides area coverage (if needed) between fixed sensor towers. If the project is not fully funded, a decrease in operations and maintenance funding can result in a shortened product life, lower product availability, and decreased performance of the system, leaving surveillance gaps along high threat areas.

3. **Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

GFE trucks and radios were delivered to vendors so that production could commence. Preparations and planning for First Article Test (FAT) including developing test procedures and the test and evaluation master plan (TEMP) were initiated in February 2011. Analysis results from FAT will be complete in March 2012.

4. **Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

ICx FAT planned for May 2012. All 15 MSC units will be delivered by Telephonics. Planned activities for FY 13 will be the delivery of 33 MSC systems from ICx and O&M activities performed by both vendors.

5. **Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2011-06-28

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	$39.1	$1.6	$0.0	$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	$39.1	$1.6	0	0
O & M Costs:	$0.0	$3.0	$4.5	$5.6
O & M Govt. FTEs:	$0.0	$0.6	$0.6	$0.3
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	0	$3.6	$5.1	$5.9
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	$39.1	$5.2	$5.1	$5.9
Total Govt. FTE costs:	0	$0.6	$0.6	$0.3
# of FTE rep by costs:	0	4	4	2
Total change from prior year final President's Budget ($)		$0.6	$0.0	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		13.00%	0.00%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

Funding Levels have not changed since the Project was initiated on 31 January 2011.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value ($M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	7014	HSBP1011C00024									
Awarded	7014	HSBP1011C00025									

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:
Earned value is not a contract requirement because this is a firm fixed price contract. For Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contracts, performance is measured and monitored in the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS). The schedule variance can be measured using the 'Finish Variance' column for key program milestones. The Finish Variance compares the Baseline Finish date to the Actual Finish date or the Baseline Finish date to the Projected Finish date. Positive Finish Variance means behind schedule, negative Finish Variance means ahead of schedule, and zero Finish Variance means on-time Additionally, the IMS narrative (which accompanies the IMS CDRL), includes a detailed write-up regarding schedule variance (level of the WBS to be negotiated between the contractor and customer), analysis on the critical path and near critical paths, any baseline changes, and Schedule Risk Assessment (SRA) results which show probabilistic schedule achievability based on three-point duration estimates using a Monte-Carlo simulation.

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-08-22

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost ($M)
1	First Article Test of vehicles	Testing of vehicles with the sensor package that is mounted to the truck for each vendor.			
2	Deployment to Arizona	Deployment of vehicle to Arizona.			
3	Vehicle Maintenance	Sustainment of the vehicle is for both the truck and sensor package that is mounted in the truck.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities ($M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance ($M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost ($M)	Count of Activities
1	First Article Test of vehicles							
2	Deployment to Arizona							
3	Vehicle Maintenance							

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)

NONE

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
NONE								